

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The pending claims in this application are Claims 1 and 4-7. In the open Office action, Claims 6 and 7 were not mentioned. The Applicant assumes that since Claims 6 and 7 are dependent from Claim 1, their patentability depends on the patentability of their parent Claim 1.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 4 and 5 under 35 USC 103 (a) as unpatentable over W0 00/62505 to Ques et al in view of US patent 5,481,613 to Ford et al. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider this rejection.

The instant invention relates to a method of processing data encrypted according to an encryption method specific to a first domain. The data is received in a presentation device connected to a network belonging to a second domain. Nowhere does Ques et al show or suggest:

"the data received in the presentation device are encrypted using a first symmetric key, said first symmetric key being received with said data in a form encrypted using the first secret;

step (a) comprises transmitting to the processing device the first symmetric key encrypted using the first secret",

as specifically set forth in Claim 1. Rather, Ques et al shows a decrypter 10 and smart card 11 which decrypt a stream of data F using key K. Ques et al then uses converter 14 to re-encrypt the data so as to be readable by their presentation devices 2 and 3, and by DVCR 4. Nowhere does Ques et al show or suggest that the data received in the presentation devices are encrypted using a symmetric key which is received with the data in a form encrypted using the first secret. Rather, Ques et al shows the presentation devices receiving data encrypted with a second key.

Ford et al relates to a computer network in which decryption is only possible when a decrypter is authorized with access specified by the encrypter. The reference uses trusted servers called key release agents. A decrypter sends the key release agent his private key in order to obtain encrypted data using a key release public-private pair.

If the disclosure of Ford et al were to be combined with the disclosure of Ques et al, the combination would allow Ques et al to choose which presentation device would be permitted to decrypt the signal on buss B. Nowhere would the combination show or suggest:

"the data received in the presentation device are encrypted using a first symmetric key, said first symmetric key being received with said data in a form encrypted using the first secret;

step (a) comprises transmitting to the processing device the first symmetric key encrypted using the first secret",

as specifically set forth in Claim 1. It is therefore clear that even if Ques et al and Ford et al were to be combined, the patentability of Claim 1 would not be affected.

Cited US 5,642,419, to Rosen, has been cited against Claim 4, which depends from Claim 1. Rosen discloses a system for electronic commerce in which a customer communicates with a first money module, and a merchant communicates with a second money module. The two money modules communicate with each other to verify payment. The Examiner has pointed to a generator of random numbers, in column 35, lines 10 to 40, to form a symmetric key. However, even if the disclosures of Ques et al were to be combined with Ford et al and Rosen, nowhere would the combination show or suggest:

"the data received in the presentation device are encrypted using a first symmetric key, said first symmetric key being received with said data in a form encrypted using the first secret;

step (a) comprises transmitting to the processing device the first symmetric key encrypted using the first secret",

as specifically recited in Claim 1. It is therefore clear that the cited references, taken either singly or in combination, do not affect the patentability of Claim 1.

Claims 4 to 7 depend from Claim 1 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 1.

The Applicant believes that the instant application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Alain Durand

7 July 2008

Date

// Daniel E. Sragow //

by Daniel E. Sragow
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 22,856
609/734-6832

Appln. No.: 10/505,390
Response dated 7 July 2008
Response to Office Action dated 11 January 2008

THOMSON LICENSING LLC
Patent Operations
2 Independence Way
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-0028